

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 11, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response extended one month set to expire on February 11, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Interview Summary

A personal interview was conducted on February 7, 2006 with the Examiner, Chance Hardie, Jason Huang and Simon Harrall. As stated in the Examiner's interview summary, the amendments presented herein to claims 1 and 71 define over the art of record including the Russian '633 and '357 documents. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 14 and 21 as currently amended are also patentable based on the traversal presented herein.

Claim Objections

Claims 8, 23, 24, 29, 54-57 and 61 stand objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claims 8, 54-57 and 61 to correct the informalities. Further, applicants submit that the cited informality of claim 29 no longer exists based on amendments to claim 21 from which claim 29 depends. Additionally, Applicants have canceled claims 23 and 24, without prejudice. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants have canceled claim 59 without prejudice thereby obviating the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 21-25, 27, 29-32, 35-37, 41, 42, 44, 46-48, 54, 57, 58 and 60-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Russian document (RU 2064357).

The '357 document discloses a blocking device with two tubes that are threaded together prior to being run into the wellbore. The blocking device is disposed entirely within the casing string upon expansion. Therefore, Applicants submit that the '357 document fails to teach, show or suggest "running a second tubing length into the bore and through the first tubing length after the first tubing length is in the bore" and "expanding at least a second portion of a remainder of the second tubing length to a third diameter larger than the second diameter, wherein the second portion is longer than the first portion and extends beyond the first tubing length," as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claims 14 and 21 recite running a second tubing length into a bore after running a first tubing length into the bore and expanding at least a portion of the first tubing length and expanding an upper end of the second tubing length. In contrast, the blocking device taught in the '357 document has the two tubes threaded together prior to being run into the wellbore. Applicants submit that claims 14 and 21 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable and patentable over the '357 document. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 21-25, 27-38, 41-45, 47-51, 53, 54, 58 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Russian document (RU 2079633).

The '633 document discloses piping (reference number 8 in Figure 1) having an upper length that is smaller in diameter and relatively longer than a bottom end of the piping. Therefore, the '633 document fails to teach, show or suggest "expanding a first portion of the second tubing length where the tubing lengths overlap, to a second diameter smaller than the first diameter; and expanding at least a second portion of the

remainder of the second tubing length to a third diameter larger than the second diameter, wherein the second portion is longer than the first portion,” as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claims 14 and 21 include the limitations of running a second tubing length such that an upper end of the second tubing length overlaps with a lower end of a first tubing length, expanding the upper end of the second tubing length to a third diameter larger than a first diameter but smaller than a second diameter, and further expanding a majority of the second tubing length to the second diameter. By contrast, the piping (reference number 8 in Figure 1) disclosed in the ‘633 document has the upper length that is smaller in diameter and relatively longer than the bottom end thereof. Applicants submit that claims 14 and 21 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable and patentable over the ‘633 document. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claims 36, 37, 39-42, 44, 47 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Smith* (U.S. Patent No. 6,808,022). Applicants have canceled all of these claims without prejudice. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 21, 23-26, 30-39, 40, 44, 47, 48, 54, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the *Baugh et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,677).

Baugh et al discloses a liner hanger with only an upper portion expanded into casing. Therefore, Applicants submit that *Baugh et al* fails to teach, show or suggest “running a second tubing length into the bore and through the first tubing length after the first tubing length is in the bore” and “expanding at least a second portion of a remainder of the second tubing length to a third diameter larger than the second diameter, wherein the second portion is longer than the first portion and extends beyond the first tubing length,” as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claims 14 and 21 include the limitations of expanding at least a portion of a first tubing length and expanding an upper end of the second tubing length, which overlaps a lower end of the first tubing length. In contrast, *Baugh et al* discloses the liner hanger expanded into the casing that is not indicated as being expanded. Applicants submit that claims 14 and 21 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable and patentable over the '357 document. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 39-43, 46, 55-60 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Russian document (RU 2064357) or the Russian document (RU 2079633).

Applicants have canceled claims 39-43, 46, and 59 without prejudice. Further, Applicants submit that claims 55-58, 60 and 62 are allowable based at least on the traversal presented above regarding independent claim 1, from which these claims depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

New Claim 71

Based on the foregoing discussion and as indicated in the Interview Summary, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach, show or suggest a method that includes running a first tubing of a first diameter into a bore, thereafter, running a second tubing into the bore and through the first tubing, such that the second tubing overlaps with a lower end of the first tubing, expanding at least a first portion of the second tubing where the first and second tubing overlap, to a second diameter, wherein expanding the first portion places the second tubing in contact with the first tubing, and expanding at least a second portion of a remainder of the second tubing adjacent the first portion to a third diameter larger than the second diameter, wherein the second portion is longer than the first portion and extends beyond the first tubing. Accordingly,

Applicant submits that claim 71 is allowable and respectfully requests allowance thereof.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14-20 are allowed. Applicants acknowledge allowance of the claims.

Claim 52 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has canceled claim 52 without prejudice thereby obviating the objection.

Conclusion

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants